

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DARNELL JAMES HAMMOND,

Petitioner,

v.

UNKNOWN,

Respondent.

No. 1:25-cv-00405-KES-SAB (HC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS  
CORPUS WITHOUT PREJUDICE,  
DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO CLOSE  
CASE, AND DECLINING TO ISSUE A  
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

Doc. 11

Petitioner Darnell James Hammond is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On July 11, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations that recommended dismissing the petition without prejudice for failure to exhaust state judicial remedies. Doc. 11. The findings and recommendations were served on petitioner and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within thirty days after service. To date, no objections have been filed, and the time for doing so has passed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

1 Having found that petitioner is not entitled to habeas relief, the court now turns to whether  
2 a certificate of appealability should issue. A petitioner seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no  
3 absolute entitlement to appeal a district court's denial of his petition, and an appeal is allowed  
4 only in certain circumstances. *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 335-36 (2003); 28 U.S.C.  
5 § 2253. Where, as here, the court denies habeas relief on procedural grounds without reaching  
6 the underlying constitutional claims, the court should issue a certificate of appealability "if jurists  
7 of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a  
8 constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was  
9 correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). "Where a plain  
10 procedural bar is present and the district court is correct to invoke it to dispose of the case, a  
11 reasonable jurist could not conclude either that the district court erred in dismissing the petition or  
12 that the petitioner should be allowed to proceed further." *Id.*

13 In the present case, the Court finds that reasonable jurists would not find the Court's  
14 determination that the petition should be dismissed debatable or wrong, or that petitioner should  
15 be allowed to proceed further. Therefore, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

16 Accordingly:

- 17 1. The findings and recommendations issued on July 11, 2025, Doc. 11, are ADOPTED  
18 in full;
- 19 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED without prejudice;
- 20 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case; and
- 21 4. The court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

22  
23  
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: October 11, 2025

26  
27  
28  
  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE